



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,864	09/21/2000	Edith H. Stern	YOR9-2000-0301 (1963-7393)	5903
7590	02/06/2004		EXAMINER	MAHMOUDI, HASSAN
Mark J Abate Morgan & Finnegan LLP 345 Park Avenue New York, NY 10154			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2175	7
			DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Applicant(s) No.	Applicant(s)
	09/666,864	STERN ET AL.
	Examiner Tony Mahmoudi	Art Unit 2175

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph C. Redmond, Jr. (Attorney of Record). (3) Tony Mahmoudi.
 (2) Dov Popovici. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 February 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claims 41-43.

Identification of prior art discussed: Murphy et al (US 6,282,362) and Walker (US 6,490,409).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The attorney of record faxed a proposed amendment and arguments to examiner on 21-January-2004. The proposed amendment was discussed in view of the newly proposed claims 40-42. The attorney presented his arguments as to how the present invention was different from the cited prior art, in that the combination of the cited references did not teach the recitation of a "camera" providing "textual description of geographical description" for images. The examiner presented his interpretation of the claims in view of the teachings of the cited references, in that Murphy et al taught the textual descriptions in forms of image labels (in figure 1) and that how the image was transmitted over a network to a server as shown by Walker (figure 2.)

The attorney pointed out that in the present invention, the geographic descriptions are provided by the "camera" to the "processing server" automatically (without user intervention). However, the recitations are not apparent to the examiner in the presently proposed claims.

The examiner suggested that changing the terms "a device for recording an image", "an image collecting device", and "a computer system for recording an image", recited in claims 40 to 42 respectively, to read "a camera", and re-writing the claims to clearly state that the textual geographic description is captured by the camera and sent to the server, and that the server accesses the descriptive text related to the image at the geographical location automatically, might overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) using Murphy et al in view of Walker.

The attorney indicated that he would proceed with filing a request for continued examination and would file an amendment to the claims including the above mentioned recommendations.